

REMARKS

Claims 1-34, 37, 38 and 40 had been cancelled previously. Claims 35 and 39 are cancelled herein. New claim 41 has been added, and claim 36 has been amended to depend therefrom. The remaining claims in this application are claims 41 and 36.

Claims 41 and 36 as presented herein are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims are made, not for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, or 112, but simply to clarify the invention and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

In the present Office Action, claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,597) in view of Yano et al. (US 2002/0113865).

Claim 35 is cancelled. Applicants submit that new claim 41 is distinguishable over Tabata and Yano for the following reasons.

New claim 41 recites:

“Method for generating image data usable in forming a hologram comprising the steps of:

generating a sequence of two-dimensional images depicting a first object viewed from different angles;

generating a sequence of images depicting a stereo model of a second object viewed from different angles;

combining the sequence of two-dimensional images with the sequence of images of the stereo model, by pasting a respective two-dimensional image depicting the first object viewed from a respective angle onto a portion of a corresponding image depicting the stereo model viewed from a corresponding angle; and

generating a parallax image train depicting the stereo model with the first object pasted thereon viewed from different angles, thereby generating a parallax image train from which said hologram is formed.”

An example of the present invention as set forth in, for example, claim 41, is well-illustrated in Figs. 7 and 8, and clearly explained at, for example, the last paragraph of page 17 to the third paragraph of page 19, of the present application.

Tabata relates to a video game machine 4 (or 1) comprising a microcomputer as a main element, and a head-mounted display (HMD) 2 which serves as an image display, connected by a cable 5 (see Figures 1 and 2; and line 39 of col. 9 to line 54 of col. 10). The HMD is worn by a user or game player, and comprises a left lens to allow a user's left eye to view a left LCD screen in the HMD, and a right lens to allow the user's right eye to view a right screen in the HMD. Using data stored in a memory card 3, the game device 4 generates left and right two-dimensional (2D) image data necessary for so-called stereo viewing. The device 4 supplies this image data through the cable to the HMD, and images represented by the left and right image data are displayed on the left and right screens in the HMD.

Tabata, at lines 1-10 of col. 10, purports to "insert" 2D background image data into 2D object image data, and supplies the resultant data to the HMD so that "stereo" images are displayed on the left and right screens of the HMD. However, Tabata's device fails to, for example, paste a 2D image of an object viewed from a respective angle onto a portion of a corresponding image of a stereo model of an object viewed from a corresponding angle, as claimed in claim 41, and shown in Figure 8 of the present application. Instead, Tabata "combines" images by merely "varying the state of display" on the left and right screens in the HMD (see lines 43-44 of col. 27). For example, Figure 36 (a) shows the left and right images when 2D images of only the objects are displayed on the screens; Figure 36 (b) shows the left and right images when 2D background images are displayed on the screens; and Figure 36 (c) shows the left and right images after "combining" the background image with the object images (see lines 37-62 of col. 27; note that Figures 38 (a)-(c) show a similar procedure). Consequently,

Tabata discloses a process inapposite that described in claim 41. Applicants further submit that since Tabata nowhere discloses, in particular, “generating a sequence of two-dimensional images depicting a first object viewed from different angles; generating a sequence of images depicting a stereo model of a second object viewed from different angles; combining the sequence of two-dimensional images with the sequence of images of the stereo model, by pasting a respective two-dimensional image depicting the first object viewed from a respective angle onto a portion of a corresponding image depicting the stereo model viewed from a corresponding angle; and generating a parallax image train depicting the stereo model with the first object pasted thereon viewed from different angles, thereby generating a parallax image train from which said hologram is formed,” claim 41 is distinguishable over Tabata.

Although Yano was cited by the Examiner to support that it is well known to generate a stereo model, Yano fails to disclose, for example, generating a sequence of images depicting a stereo model of an object viewed from different angles, or combining that sequence with a sequence of 2D images depicting another object viewed from different angles, as claimed in claim 41. Instead, Yano generates a virtual image by arranging a “three-dimensional model” in a 3D coordinates system, and projects the model to a virtual image surface (see claim 7). As a result, Yano discloses a process inapposite that claimed in claim 41. Applicants further submit that since Yano fails to disclose, specifically, “generating a sequence of two-dimensional images depicting a first object viewed from different angles; generating a sequence of images depicting a stereo model of a second object viewed from different angles; combining the sequence of two-dimensional images with the sequence of images of the stereo model, by pasting a respective two-dimensional image depicting the first object viewed from a respective angle onto a portion of a corresponding image depicting the stereo model viewed from a corresponding angle; and generating a parallax image train depicting the stereo model with the first object pasted thereon

viewed from different angles, thereby generating a parallax image train from which said hologram is formed,” claim 41 is distinguishable over Yano.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 41 is distinguishable over either of Tabata and Yano, taken alone or in combination.

Claims 36 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata and Yano, in view of Benton (U.S. Patent No. 4,834,476).

Claim 39 is cancelled. Amended claim 36 recites in part the “method according to claim 41, further comprising...sequentially recording each image of the parallax image train as an element hologram.”

Since the Examiner does not rely on Benton to cure the above-described deficiencies in Tabata and Yano, Applicants submit that amended claim 36, which depends now from new claim 41, is therefore distinguishable over the combination of Tabata, Yano and Benton for at least reasons similar to those previously discussed.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is respectfully solicited.

The foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of Applicants’ undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 
William S. Frommer
Registration No. 25,506
Tel. (212) 588-0800